GC

GC(42)/COM.5/OR.5
21 October 1998
GENERAL Distr.

International Atomic Energy Agency
GENERAL CONFERENCE

Original: ENGLISH

FORTY-SECOND (1998) REGULAR SESSION

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RECORD OF THE FIFTH MEETING

Held at the Austria Center, Vienna,
on Thursday, 24 September 1998, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. JOSEPH (Australia)
Later: Mr. UMER (Pakistan)

CONTENTS

Item of the agenda*		Paragraphs
12	Measures to strengthen international co-operation in nuclear, radiation and waste safety (resumed)	1 - 12
13	Strengthening of the Agency's technical co-operation activities (resumed)	13 - 49

[*] GC(42)/20.

For reasons of economy, this document has been printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their own copies of documents to meetings.

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document GC(42)/INF/13/Rev.3.

98-03430 (XXXVII)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, in a memorandum and/or incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent to the Division of Languages, International Atomic Energy Agency, Wagramerstrasse 5, P.O. Box 100, A-1400 Vienna, Austria. Corrections should be submitted within three weeks of the receipt of the record.

Abbreviations used in this record

TCF	Technical Co-operation Fund

MEASURES TO STRENGTHEN INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN NUCLEAR, RADIATION AND WASTE SAFETY (resumed)
(GC(42)/INF/3 and GC(42)/COM.5/10/Rev.1; GC(42)/COM.5/5/Rev.1)

1. Mr. BOBADILLA LÓPEZ (Chile), introducing the draft resolution contained in document GC(42)/COM.5/10/Rev.1, said that the conclusions of the Study of the Radiological Situation at the Atolls of Mururoa and Fangataufa were of great importance for many countries, including Chile.

2. The Study had been conducted in a highly professional manner and could serve as a model for similar exercises. The conclusions of the Study, endorsed recently at the Agency-organized International Conference on the Radiological Situation at the Atolls of Mururoa and Fangataufa, were encouraging, but they could in no way be taken as justifying the conduct of nuclear weapons tests in any part of the world.

3. Mr. BENINSON (Argentina), commending the Secretariat for one of the best environmental studies of its kind ever carried out, said that its high quality had been due very largely to the work of Dr. Robert Fry of Australia.

4. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the fourth operative paragraph be amended to read "Requests the Director General to report to it, as appropriate, on apposite developments in this area" and took it that the Committee wished to recommend the draft resolution, as amended, to the General Conference for adoption.

5. It was so agreed.

6. Mr. MCINTOSH (Australia) said that the text of the draft resolution on the "Safety of transport of radioactive materials" contained in document GC(42)/COM.5/5/Rev.1 had been agreed upon *ad referendum* during further informal consultations.

7. Mr. ARAR (Turkey), expressing gratitude to colleagues from other delegations for their constructive contributions during the informal consultations, said he hoped that the revised text would finally attract a consensus.

8. He had one minor amendment to propose - the insertion of "also" after "Noting" in preambular paragraph (h).

9. Mr. TOWLER (United Kingdom) thanked the co-authors of the draft resolution for taking account of the concerns of major shipping States.

10. Mr. DELACROIX (France) said that the informal consultations had taken place in a very constructive atmosphere, producing a generally acceptable result.

11. Mr. TITKOV (Russian Federation), recalling that agreement in the informal consultations had been reached *ad referendum*, said that his delegation would seek instructions immediately.

12. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would revert to the draft resolution at its next meeting.

STRENGTHENING OF THE AGENCY'S TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION ACTIVITIES (resumed)
(GC(42)/COM.5/3/Rev.2)

13. The CHAIRMAN, drawing the Committee's attention to the revised draft resolution in document GC(42)/COM.5/3/Rev.2, said that it had been prepared after the conclusion of the Committee's previous meeting.

14. Mr. MCINTOSH (Australia), referring to operative paragraph 7, said that regional centres of excellence might be identified in Member States that were not developing countries. He therefore proposed that the phrase ", in developing Member States," be deleted.

15. Mr. CRONJE (South Africa) said he believed that the Group of 77 could agree to the deletion of that phrase.

16. He in turn wished to propose the replacement of "for enhancing" by "in the context of enhancing" and the deletion of "and scientific" (so that operative paragraph 7 would end "... in the context of enhancing Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries").

17. Referring to preambular paragraph (f), he said that the Group of 77 had in a spirit of compromise agreed to delete the reference, in the text contained in document GC(42)/COM.5/3/Rev.1, to "the Kyoto Conference on Climate Change" and to use the wording of the preambular paragraph of resolution GC(41)/RES/13.

18. Mr. CASTERTON (Canada) proposed replacing "will" by "would" in preambular paragraph (i).

19. Mr. MCINTOSH (Australia) proposed that in preambular paragraph (i) the phrase "in target figures for the 2001-2002 biennium" be inserted after "an increase".

20. The CHAIRMAN, assuming that that proposal was acceptable, proposed that the phrase "for 2001-2002" be added at the end of operative paragraph 2".

21. Mr. CRONJE (South Africa) said he thought the proposals made by the representatives of Canada and Australia and by the Chairman would be acceptable to the Group of 77.

22. Commenting on operative paragraph 3, he pointed out that the phrase ", in particular major donors," - which had appeared in the first revised version of the draft resolution - had been deleted. The reference to assessed programme costs had also been deleted, in the light of consultations with the Secretariat, which had indicated that the payment of assessed programme costs was obligatory under the Agency's Financial Regulations.

23. Mr. BORCHARD (Germany), supported by Mr. PETROV (Bulgaria), said that his delegation would like to see the word "voluntary" before "contributions" in operative paragraph 3.

24. Mr. TOWLER (United Kingdom) said that, if the payment of assessed programme costs was an obligation, he would like to see something along the lines of "and reminds all Member States of their obligation to pay their assessed programme costs" added to operative paragraph 3.

25. Mr. PECSTEEN (Belgium), having endorsed what had been said by the representative of Germany, suggested that TCF contributions and assessed programme costs be dealt with in separate paragraphs - payment of the latter was obligatory, whereas payment of the former was voluntary.

26. Mr. YAMANAKA (Japan) and Mr. GOLDMAN (United States of America) expressed support for what had been said made by the representative of the United Kingdom.

27. Mr. MCINTOSH (Australia), referring to what had been said by the representative of Germany, said that in his view the phrase "to make every effort" was sufficient indication that TCF contributions were voluntary.

28. Mr. DUFVA (Sweden) said that the Swedish Parliament had declared that nuclear power was not a sustainable or environmentally safe energy source. Thus, his delegation was unhappy about preambular paragraph (f) and operative paragraph 4, which implied that the introduction of nuclear power was a solution to the problem of climate change.

29. Mr. SARWAT (Egypt) said that in his view it would be better to leave the word "contributions" in operative paragraph 3 unqualified - simply to say "their contributions".

30. As the reference to major donors had been removed from operative paragraph 3, it seemed only fair that there should be no reference to recipient countries through the mention of assessed programme costs.

31. Mr. CRONJE (South Africa) said that in his view the Group of 77 could accept the addition to operative paragraph 3 envisaged by the United Kingdom representative, but only if absolutely necessary. He did not think there was any need to qualify "contributions".

32. Mr. ZHENG Kemin (China) said his delegation could accept the revised version of operative paragraph 4, which accorded well with the urgent need of China - and several other developing countries - for nuclear power.

33. Mr. FRANCK (Luxembourg) said that there was a need to ensure Agency technical assistance financing on as universal a basis as possible and his country did not want to stand in the way of any country asking for Agency technical assistance with its nuclear power programme. The Luxembourg authorities would examine the text of the resolution as

adopted very carefully before making a commitment vis-à-vis the TCF, however, and he feared that the current language of operative paragraph 4 might present some problems.

34. Mr. KEMPEL (Austria) said he agreed with the representative of China that for a number of developing countries the nuclear power option was extremely important. In his view, the interests of such countries would be accommodated if the last part of operative paragraph 4 read "... by continuing to assist them in their peaceful applications of atomic energy and nuclear techniques in the fields of agriculture, medicine, nuclear energy production, industry, water resource management, environment etc.;".

35. Mr. GOLDMAN (United States of America) and Mr. DI SAPIA (Italy) expressed support for that wording.

36. Mr. RAGHURAMAN (India) Mr. ZHENG Kemin (China), Mr. FRASK LUCERO (Brazil) and Mr. SHOAIB (Pakistan) said that they would prefer it if operative paragraph 4 was left unchanged.

Mr. Umer (Pakistan) took the Chair.

37. The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee was happy to replace "encourage" with "assist them in their" and to leave the rest of operative paragraph 4 as it stood.

38. Mr. FRASK LUCERO (Brazil) and Mr. RAGHURAMAN (India) said that their delegations were.

39. Mr. KEMPEL (Austria) said that the European Union delegations could not go along with subparagraph (b) as it stood.

40. Mr. SHOAIB (Pakistan) urged that subparagraph (b) be left unchanged.

41. Mr. WILKE (Netherlands) said that the simplest solution might be to delete the word "important" in subparagraph (b).

42. Mr. KEMPEL (Austria) said that he was not happy with that solution.

43. Mr. MOONEY (Ireland) said that his delegation would really like sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) to be deleted altogether, so that operative paragraph 4 ended with the words "countries concerned".

44. Mr. MCINTOSH (Australia) said that for many States nuclear power would not be "an important component of the energy mix for the 21st century" and that for many others it would have no role to play at all. What seemed to be needed was wording which reflected the fact that nuclear power would be important only for some States.

45. Mr. CRONJE (South Africa) proposed that subparagraph (b) be amended to read "nuclear energy production for those States pursuing it as a component of the energy mix in the 21st century ...".

46. Mr. KEMPEL (Austria) said that the European Union could accept that wording.

47. Mr. MOONEY (Ireland) said that his delegation would like to reserve its position on the draft resolution pending consultations with its Government.

48. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that, subject to the position of the delegation of Ireland, the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution in document GC(42)/COM.5/3/Rev.2 with the following amendments: the addition of ", recalling that the Board of Governors approved recommendations to that effect as contained in document GOV/1998/36" in preambular paragraph (g); the replacement of "will" by "would" and the addition of "in the target figures for the 2001-2002 biennium" after "an increase" in preambular paragraph (i); the addition of "for 2001-2002" at the end of operative paragraph 2; the addition of "and reminds Member States of their obligation to pay their assessed programme costs" at the end of operative paragraph 3; the replacement of "encourage" by "assist them in their" and of "nuclear energy as an important component" by "nuclear energy production for those States pursuing it as a component" in operative paragraph 4; and the deletion of ", in developing Member States," and the replacement of "for enhancing technical and scientific co-operation among developing countries" by "in the context of enhancing Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries" in operative paragraph 7.

49. The Committee would revert to the matter at the beginning of its next meeting.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.